

REMARKS

Claims 31 and 37 have been amended herein. Claims 33, 36, 39, and 42 have been cancelled herein. Claims 1-30 were cancelled previously. Claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, and 41 are pending.

In the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, claims 36 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly "generally confusing and indefinite." These rejections now have been overcome or mooted, because claims 36 and 42 have been cancelled herein, and the allegedly indefinite language has not been moved to any other claim.

In the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, claims 35 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, based on an allegation that the claim language "radial reach" is indefinite "since it is not a recognized term in the art." *See* page 2, line 5, of the non-final Office action mailed 28 May 2008. However, even if the two words together do not form a recognized term in the art, applicant's intended meaning accords with the plain meaning of each word taken individually. For example, "reach" has the ordinary meaning: "The extent or distance something can reach." *See, e.g.,* <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/reach> . Likewise, "radial" has the ordinary meaning: "Moving or directed along a radius." *See, e.g.,* <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/radial> .

Therefore, the term "radial reach," whether it is a recognized term in the art or not, has a definite ordinary meaning as "the extent something can reach along a radius." Furthermore, the specification adequately describes and puts such ordinary meaning into a definite context on pages 13-14 of the patent application as originally filed. Specifically, page 13, line 1, through page 14, line 19, read in conjunction with Fig. 3 as originally filed, repeatedly uses the term "radial reach" in a definite context such that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no doubts about its meaning. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 35 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

In the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, on page 4 under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter," claims 33 and 39 were objected to as depending upon a rejected base claim, but were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their base claims 31 and 37, respectively (there being no intervening claims). Accordingly, base claims 31 and 37 have been amended herein to include the limitations of claims 33 and 39, respectively, so that claims 31 and 37 reflect exactly the subject matter that was deemed allowable by the examiner. Claims 33 and 39 were cancelled because the limitations that they presented were moved into base claims 31 and 37, respectively. Therefore, the Applicants hereby request allowance of claims 31 and 37, and all pending claims that depend from claims 31 and 37.

In the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, claims 31, 32, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by US 2,025,848 to Collis (hereinafter Collis). However, as described above, the rejection of claim 31 has been overcome by amendment to include the deemed-allowable subject matter of cancelled dependent claim 33. Likewise, claims 32 and 35 are now allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim (claim 31 as amended). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 31, 32, and 35.

Also in the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, claims 37, 38, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US 6,856,485 to Toh (hereinafter Toh) in view of Collis. However, as described above, the rejection of claim 37 has been overcome by amendment to include the deemed-allowable subject matter of cancelled dependent claim 39. Likewise, claims 38 and 41 are now allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim (claim 37 as amended). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 37, 38, and 41.

Also in the non-final Office Action mailed on 28 May 2008, claims 34 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Collis or Toh in view of Collis, and further in view of US 4,934,888 to Corsmeier. However, claims 34 and 40 are now allowable at least because each depends from an allowable base claim (claim 31 as amended, and claim 37 as amended, respectively). Therefore, Applicants request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 34 and 40.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, and 41 are now in condition for allowance. If a telephone conversation might expedite the prosecution of the present application the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4119.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 21 September, 2008

By: _____
Joshua C. Harrison, Ph.D., Esq.
Reg. No. 45,686

BARCELÓ & HARRISON, LLP
2901 W. Coast Highway, Suite 200
Newport Beach, CA 92663
Tel.: (949) 340-9736
Fax: (949) 258-5752